

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION

Randy Lee Grainger,

Plaintiff,

v.

JRL Detention Center, Mediko, Corporal  
Cribb, Corporal Vermeer, Officer Childers,  
Officer Oliver, Officer Linnen, Nurse Rachel,  
and Mental health Counselor Jennifer,

Defendants.

C/A No.: 8:22-cv-306-SAL-JDA

**ORDER**

This matter is before the court for review of both the February 22, 2022 Report and Recommendation and the May 20, 2022 Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Jacquelyn D. Austin, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). [ECF Nos. 13, 37.] In the February Report, the Magistrate Judge conducted the required screening pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and recommends dismissing the Detention Center and Mediko as defendants because Plaintiff failed to allege facts supporting a claim for relief against those parties. [ECF No. 13, p. 6.] Attached to the Report was a notice advising the parties of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the report. *Id.* at 7. Plaintiff failed to file objections to the February report, and the time for doing so has expired.

Further, in the May Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends granting the Motion to Dismiss as to Counts One and Four, ECF No. 24, filed by Defendants Cribb, Vermeer, Childers, Oliver, and Linnen. [ECF No. 37, p. 13.] Attached to the Report was a notice advising the parties of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report. [ECF No. 37-1, p. 1.] None of the parties filed objections, and the time for doing so has expired.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of only those portions of the Report that have been specifically objected to, and the court may accept, reject, or modify the Report, in whole or in part. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of objections, the court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report and must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of both Reports, the applicable law, and the record of this case in accordance with the above standard, the court finds no clear error, adopts both Reports, ECF Nos. 13 and 37, and incorporates the Reports by reference herein. Accordingly, Defendants’ motion to dismiss, ECF No. 24, is **GRANTED**. Further, the court directs the Clerk of Court to dismiss Defendants Detention Center, Mediko, Childers, Cribb, and Oliver as parties to this action. This matter is referred back to the Magistrate Judge for further proceedings.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

November 15, 2022  
Columbia, South Carolina

/s/Sherri A. Lydon  
Sherri A. Lydon  
United States District Judge